

Discourse as Medium of Knowledge: Transmission of Knowledge by Transmission of Discourse People Live

Rukya Hassen (PhD)
Assistant professor, Wollo University

Abstract

This is a study on discourse as medium of knowledge. Informal education is a system of transmission of knowledge by transmission of discourse people live by. In the humanities and social sciences, the term discourse describes a formal way of thinking that can be expressed through language. Discourses are seen to affect our views on all things; it is not possible to avoid discourse. Discourses is a way of representing aspects of the world - the processes, relations and structures of the material world, the mental world of thoughts, feelings, beliefs, and the social world. Like elsewhere, in the traditional Ethiopian cultures, there are many social practices that govern conscience. There are many rules of thumb that people agree to govern their lives with. Different discourses from various social practices in the traditional Ethiopian community that are transmitted through oral discourse were taken for analysis. The result of the study shows that knowledge through informal education is transmitted through discourse. Discourse has become both the means and the end of knowledge and its transmission. Discourse is shaped by many factors such as culture, language, participant, and history. It, in turn, shapes them back. Discourse shapes and reshapes the thought and practice of the speech community who owns it. It is a replicator, re-constructer and preserver of social change. Discourse facilitates specific changes. It is an agent of social change. Social changes are changes in discourse. Discourses are reinforced by existing systems of education and the media. There is no place to stand outside such systems. Discourse takes the role of building, producing, accumulating, reinforcing, constructing, resisting, legitimizing, criticizing and transmitting knowledge. Informal education is all about learning community discourse. In the discourse is embedded the society's cultural performances, beliefs, social practices, norms, rituals, and social rules required for continued existence. Hence, discourse plays the role of mediating knowledge transmission.

Key Words: discourse, social practice, knowledge, thought, informal education

1. Introduction

Ethiopia is a land of diversity where many ethnic, religious, linguistic, and cultural groups of different kinds co-exist. There are many discourses spoken in the country. Different cultures are exhibited through ways of dressings, living, eating and day-to-day activities. The majority of the people belong to Christianity and Islam in religion, and Oromo and Amhara in language-based ethnic group. There is a lot of cultural and linguistic diffusion among the various groups because of contact. An extended and cherished relationship has been formed among the different ethnic groups of the country through migration, intermarriage and assimilation (Levine, 1971:13).

The power of discourse in defining and shaping the realities of contemporary society cannot be underestimated. Discourse carries the tradition, history, culture and way of life of its speakers. Discourse cannot be conceptualized without the people, nor can the people without their discourse. The people and its discourse are in each other's pocket. To know the discourse means to know the people who use it. Studying the linguistic and cultural features help to understand what lies beneath the belief and value systems of the people. Studying the discourse of a particular society gives the whole picture as to who they are, what their belief and values are and how and why they use their discourse.

Nothing defines people better than their discourse. Discourse unfolds the values, cultural themes and beliefs of the people that define how and why they live in the way they do. Access to the discourse of people provides with the necessary information about the patterns of life.

Fairclough, after Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics, established that discourse contributes to the construction of social identities, social relations, and systems of knowledge and meaning (Wodak, 2002: 17; Jorgensen, and Phillips, 2002:67; Blommaert, 2005:23). Hence, discourse has three functions: an identity function, a 'relational' function and an 'ideational' function. This three dimensional discourse which Fairclough (1995) has constructed is a useful framework for the analysis of discourse as social practice (Jorgensen, and Phillips, 2002:64). Van Dijk offers a more thorough-going theoretical base for socio-cognitive analysis (O'Halloran, 2011:449). Van Dijk gives special attention to the role of cognition to understand and interpret

texts and discourse. Macrostructure and microstructure of Van Dijk is also an important framework for discourse analysis. Macrostructure “is used to account for the various notions of global meaning, such as topic, theme, or gist. This implies that macrostructures in discourse are semantic objects” (Van Dijk, 1980: 1). Related to Macro and Micro structure of Van Dijk is what Gee calls “discourse” and “Discourse” (1999:7): the former refers to instances of language in use, actual speech events; the latter to (far more abstract) ways of using language.

Like elsewhere, in the traditional Ethiopian cultures, there are many cultural beliefs that govern conscience or sense of right and wrong. There are many rules of thumb that people agree to govern their lives with. The knowledge is transmitted through discourse. Discourse has become both the means and the end of knowledge and its transmission. This is consonant with the idea of Johnstone who said, “Discourse is both the source of knowledge (people’s generalizations about language are made on the basis of the discourse they participate in) and the result of it (people apply what they already know in creating and interpreting new discourse)” (2008:3).

2. Research Methodology

Discourse analysis has been taken up in a variety of social science disciplines, including linguistics, education, sociology, anthropology, social work, cognitive psychology, Social psychology, International relations, human geography, communication studies, and translation studies each of which is subject to its own assumptions, dimensions of analysis, and methodologies.

The data for this study is discourse. Different community/public discourses were collected to investigate how people use to transmit knowledge through it. Data were collected from 126 Bajajes, 79 Taxies 273 mobile and face book texts and 365 University (Addis Ababa, Wollo, Bahir Dar) classroom, chair, corridor and toilet wall texts.

The methodology of discourse analysis prefer to analyze 'naturally occurring' data, and instead of invented examples in order to understand real human behavior. We have identified a topic for analysis, and then collect a corpus of texts, before finally analyzing it to identify how people reproduce ideologies in text and talk. A corpus is large, structured database of texts. Corpus is, “a large and principled collection of natural texts” (Biber, Conrad and Reppen, 1998:12). ‘Corpus’ stands for a ‘databank’ of really used language by the speakers in their real lives (Cook, 2003:73). The data were analyzed using corpus-based description, and critical discourse analysis. Corpus-based analysis has been done on archival and recorded discourse.

There is no readymade corpus collection in any of the languages of Ethiopia so far that can be used to this end. Therefore, a corpus or a large and principled natural texts (speech and written) were collected. The discourse of the target group were manually recorded and described. The analysis was based entirely on the collected corpus.

As a critical theory, CDA aims at ‘demystifying’ or clarifying discourse. It is a problem-oriented approach. “Social problems are the items of research, such as “racism, identity, gender, social change”, which, of course, are and could be studied from manifold perspectives. (Wodak, 2005:2).

3. Discourse

A discourse is a language or system of representation that has developed socially in order to make and circulate a coherent set of meanings about an important topic area. It “refers to socially shared habits of thought, perception, and behavior reflected in numerous texts belonging to different genres” (Scollon and Scollon, 2001:538).

In the Social_sciences, a discourse is considered to be an institutionalized way of thinking, a social boundary defining what can be said about a specific topic. Discourses are seen to affect our views on all things; in other words, it is not possible to escape discourse. For example, two distinctly different discourses can be used about various guerrilla movements describing them either as "freedom fighters" or "terrorists". In other words, the chosen discourse delivers the vocabulary, expressions and perhaps also the style needed to communicate.

Discourse is a conversation or text; collection of texts or conversations; a shared way of talking or creating texts (code); codes, languages, ways of speaking of a topic. In sum, Discourse can be defi./p/ned in three ways: 1) Language beyond the level of a sentence; 2) Language behaviors linked to social practices and 3) Language as a system of thought.

Discourse is here understood to mean specific communicative events, in general, and a written or oral form of verbal interaction, in particular. In the broader, "semiotic" sense, discourses may also feature nonverbal expressions such as drawings, pictures, gestures, face-work, and so on. The socio-semiotic approach views language as the embodiment of the social process in a society.

Discourse is a way of representing aspects of the world - the processes, relations and structures of the material world, the 'mental world' of thoughts, feelings, beliefs and so forth, and the social world.

Discourse "refers to socially shared habits of thought, perception, and behavior reflected in numerous texts belonging to different genres" (Scollon and Scollon, 2001:538). Discourse carries the history, way of life of people. In CDA, discourse is language use in speech and writing which is a form of 'social practice' (Wodak, 2002:7). Discourse means anything from history, narratives, text, talk, a speech, topic-related conversations; stretching the meaning of discourse from a genre to a register and to a code and language (Wodak and Meyer, 2009:3).

Discourse Analysis (DA) emphasizes on the analysis of the internal cognition of a society's practice as expressed through their language. It focuses on talk and texts as social practices (Potter, 1996:5). According to Potter (2004:3):

DA has an analytic commitment to studying discourse as texts and talk in social practice. That is, the focus is not on language as an abstract entity such as a lexicon and set of grammatical rules (in linguistics), a system of differences (in structuralism), or a set of rules for transforming statements. Instead, it is the medium for interaction; analysis of discourse becomes, then, analysis of what people do.

4. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is more involved in the inner psychology of people. Van Dijk (2001:352) defined CDA as:

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context with such dissident research, critical discourse analysis take explicit position, and thus want to understand, expose, and ultimately resist social inequality

CDA views language as a social practice', and takes consideration of the context of language use as an important aspect (Wodak, and Meyer, 2001:1). Researchers who use CDA as a method can describe, interpret, and explain relationships among languages and other social factors (Rogers, 2004:1). Fairclough and Wodak (1997) offered eight basic principles to explain CDA. The principles are useful starting points for researchers interested in conducting CDA (Van Dijk, 2001:353; Rogers, 2004:1). These are:

1. CDA addresses social problems.
2. Power relations are discursive.
3. Discourse constitutes society and culture.
4. Discourse does ideological work.
5. Discourse is historical.
6. The link between text and society is mediated.
7. Discourse analysis is interpretive and explanatory.
8. CDA is a socially committed scientific paradigm.

Discourse refers to the use of language in social contexts (Seidlhofer, 2003:133). Fairclough calls it "any reasonably systematic application of reasonably well-defined procedures to a reasonably well-defined body of data" (Seidlhofer, 2003: 148). Johnstone (2008:3) argues that we call what we do 'discourse analysis' rather than 'language analysis' because we are not centrally focused on language as an abstract system. Rather, we are concerned with the functional aspect of language use focusing on what people do with language or what language can do for its users.

5. Discourse shapes and is shaped

Discourse is shaped by culture/setting, language, participant, prior discourse, medium, and purpose (Johnstone, 2000:124-6). Discourse is shaped by many factors such as culture, language, participant, history, and purpose (Johnstone, 2000:124-6). Discourse shapes and reshapes the thought and practice of the speech community who owns it. It is a replicator, re-constructor and preserver of social change. Discourse facilitates specific changes. Wodak (2002) insists that social changes are changes in discourse.

To access the social and linguistic change, we need to attend to people's casual and non-casual talk. "For communication researchers, then, discourse analysis is the close study of talk (or text) in context" (Tracy, 2001:734). Talks are rarely described by linguists. However, explanation about them by linguists could be of great help to understand and describe how language is used by a certain speech group. As Tracy (2001:738) further claims, "Talk is not just a phenomenon to be scientifically described and explained, it is moral and practical action taken by one person toward others. Talk not only can be evaluated, but should be." In the present study, talk is interchangeably used as discourse because as Johnstone (2000:103) stated discourse is 'language in use'.

6. Discourse as representative

Discourse is a way of representing aspects of the world - the processes, relations and structures of the material world, the 'mental world' of thoughts, feelings, beliefs and so forth, and the social world. Particular aspects of the world may be represented differently, so we are generally in the position of having to consider the relationship between different discourses. Different discourses are different perspectives on the world, and they are associated with the different relations people have to the world, which in turn depends on their positions in the world, their social and personal identities, and the social relationships in which they stand to other people. Discourses not only represent the world as it is (or rather is seen to be), they are also projective, imaginaries, representing possible worlds which are different from the actual world, and tied in to projects to change the world in particular directions. The relationships between different discourses are one element of the relationships between different people - they may complement one another, compete with one another, one can dominate others, and so forth. Discourses constitute part of the resources which people deploy in relating to one another - keeping separate from one another, cooperating, competing, dominating and in seeking to change the ways in which they relate to one another (Fairclough, 2003:87).

7. Discourse as other stuff that isn't language

People build identities and activities not just through language but by using language together with other 'stuff' that isn't language. If you want to get recognized as a street-gang member of a certain sort, you have to speak in the 'right' way, but you have to act and dress in the 'right' way, as well. You also have to engage (or, at least, behave as if you are engaging) in characteristic ways of thinking, acting, interacting, valuing, feeling, and believing. You also have to use or be able to use various sorts of symbols (e.g., graffiti), tools (e.g. a weapon), and objects (e.g., street corners) in the 'right' places and at the 'right' times. You can't just 'talk the talk' you have to 'walk the walk' as well. The same is true of doing/being a corporate lawyer, Marine sergeant, radical feminist, or a regular at the local bar. One and the same person might talk, act, and interact in such a way as to get recognized as a 'street-gang member' in one context and in another context, talk, act, and interact in quite different ways so as to get recognized as a 'gifted student.' And, indeed, these two identities, and their associated ways of talking, acting, and interacting, may well conflict with each other in some circumstances (in which different people expect different identities from the person), as well as in the person's own mind. I use the term 'Discourse' with a capital 'D' for ways of combining and integrating language, actions, interactions, ways of thinking, believing, valuing, and using various symbols, tools, and objects to enact a particular sort of socially recognizable identity. Thinking about the different Discourses a piece of language is part of is another tool for engaging in language studies. (James Paul Gee, 1999: 20-21)

8. Discourse dependent on history and context

The discourse-historical approach is associated with Ruth Wodak. Wodak emphasises on considering the wider context of discourse (Wooffitt, 2005:138). She gives importance on the contextualizing and historicizing of texts (O'Halloran, 2011:449). Analysis of discourse looks not only at the basic level of what is said, but takes into consideration the surrounding social and historical contexts.

9. Electronic discourse

The concept of discourse has conventionally been thought of and taught in terms of written and spoken discourse. However, the advent and global use of information technology in the 20th century has seen the emergence of a new discourse – electronic discourse found in e-mails, Internet-relay chats (IRC), and homepages – which is used to communicate across time and geographical borders. Electronic discourse is defined as language that is used to communicate in cyberspace, which Yates (2001: 106) refers to as the ‘imaginary space created by the Internet in which people interact and form social relationships’. While students seem to be very comfortable and adept at using this new discourse to communicate, teachers appear to be in awe and at times even intimidated by it. One of the reasons for this could be the difficulty in categorising this new kind of discourse because it is neither purely written nor spoken, but shares features of both types of discourse simultaneously. Researchers argue that electronic discourse is developing and becoming a new form of communication in its own right, and that teachers should be aware of it in the language classroom.

We cannot deny that the advent and global use of information technology has resulted in the emergence of a new discourse – e-discourse (e-discourse), as seen in e-mails, Internet-relay chats (IRC) and homepages – which is used to communicate across time and geographical borders.

Electronic discourse is use of language that has the immediacy characteristic of speech and the permanence characteristic of writing. e-discourse comes with hybridisation of new medium of communication. The term hybridisation is used to refer to the process whereby e-discourse emerges as a composite of features of spoken discourse, written discourse and features specific to e-discourse.

New technologies are constantly transforming traditional notions of language use and literacy in online communication environments. While previous research has provided a foundation for understanding the use of new technologies in instructed second language environments, few studies have investigated new literacies and electronic discourse beyond the classroom setting. This volume seeks to address this gap by providing corpus-based and empirical studies of electronic discourse analyzing social and linguistic variation as well as communicative practices in chat, discussion forums, blogs, and podcasts. Several chapters also examine the assessment and integration of new literacies.

10. Discourse as agent of change

(“Successful”) discourses may be enacted in new ways of acting and interacting (including new genres), inculcated in ways of being or identities (including new styles), materialized in new technologies, physical environments etc. Wider social change may originate in the imaginaries projected in discourses (Fairclough, 2005:67).

Discourse shapes and reshapes the thought and practice of the speech community who owns it. It is a replicator, re-constructor and preserver of social change. Discourse facilitates specific changes. Wodak (2002) insists that social changes are changes in discourse. To see how discourse shapes beliefs, thinking, imagination, vision, power, statues and other values, some thematically selected discourses are critically analyzed in this part of the study.

11. ‘Discourse is both the source of knowledge and the result of it’: Public discourse from somebody to everybody

Informal education takes place through discourse. The public space is used to educating the public through discourse. There are many emerging themes displayed in different public places based on which the target community shape their thoughts, attitude, views, beliefs and practices. Community discourse is used to teach the public about some important social issues such as racism, gender, identity, religion and sexism. The following sections will discuss how discourse has become as medium of transmission of knowledge about these socially significant matters.

11.1. Racism

Discourse plays a central role not only in the text studies of the humanities, but also in the social sciences, and virtually all dimensions of the study of prejudice, discrimination, and racism which have an important discursive dimension. Racist talk and thought are most evident in the everyday conversations and texts that the dominant society produces about each other. Yet in contemporary cultures, open racist talk and similarly explicitly coded

racist texts are taboo, often legally outlawed and socially censured. Both in everyday conversations and in mass-mediated texts, in part demonstrate that explicit racist discourse racism abundantly exist. The public space have the power to amplify and legitimate racist discourse and, hence, offer us a lens through which to interrogate popular assumptions and premises regarding identity and racism. Racist discourse operates to perpetuate unequal relations of power and maintain hierarchies of privilege in contemporary societies. The following example shows this.

KeX-ethnic group denkoro keZ-ethnic group awre keY-ethnic group ahy aafelgm bye semeleket lela
Beteseb meretelgn endzamed kandit yemtmesl yeke setan keM-ethnic group gara
Aye
No no no
Yishalegnal bnor keN- ethnic group (source: facebook)

Generalization and extending unsupportive messages through public display is a dominant discourse in the current community. For instance,

Y-ethnic group means donkey
X-ethnic group means slave
Z-ethnic group means beggar
M- ethnic group means Ethiopian slave (Dorm 117, WU)

People don't only extend stereotypes and prejudices about out-groups but in-groups too. For example, the following discourse is stated about Ethiopians by Ethiopians.

America has wisdom
Arabs have Riyal
Indians have love
Ethiopians have nothing (facebook)

Ethnic and racial inequality in all social, political, and cultural domains is multiply expressed, described, planned, legislated, regulated, executed, legitimated, and opposed in myriad genres of discourse and communicative events. Such discourse is not mere text and talk, and hence of marginal relevance. On the contrary, especially in contemporary information and communication societies, such text and talk are at the heart of the polity, society, and culture, and hence also in their mechanisms of continuity and reproduction, including those of racism.

Although discourse may seem just "words" (and therefore cannot break your bones, as do sticks and stones), text and talk play a vital role in the reproduction of contemporary racism.

X-ethnic group girls for X-ethnic group boys. Don't mix Habesha! (Students' lounge BDU)
Egna Y-ethnic groups yengus zer nen (toilet AAU)
Y-ethnic groups hezb yeEthiopia megegna new (Dorm 73, WU)

This is especially true for the most damaging forms of contemporary racism, namely, those of the elites. Political, bureaucratic, corporate, media, educational, and scholarly elites control the most crucial dimensions and decisions of the everyday lives of immigrants and minorities: entry, residence, work, housing, education, welfare, health care, knowledge, information, and culture. They do so largely by speaking or writing, for instance; in cabinet meetings and parliamentary debates, in job interviews, news reports, advertising, lessons, textbooks, scholarly articles, movies or talk shows, among many other forms of elite discourse.

That is, as is true also for other social practices directed against minorities, discourse may first of all be a form of verbal discrimination. Elite discourse may thus constitute an important elite form of racism: Similarly, the (re)production of ethnic prejudices that underlie such verbal and other social practices largely takes place through text, talk, and communication. In sum, especially in contemporary information societies, discourse lies at the heart of racism.

The public space dominates racist talk and text on and about 'racial' and ethnic others. In a series of studies, van Dijk (1987; 1992; 1993) developed a conceptual tool called 'the ideological square' which he argues dominates racist talk and text on and about 'racial' and ethnic others. This ideo-logical square is characterized by a Positive

Self-Presentation and a simultaneous Negative Other-Presentation and is observable across all linguistic dimensions of a text.

X- ethnic group berle and nachew huletum hod enji chinklat yelachewm

Y- ethnic group korkoro new sinekut yichohal Z- ethnic group mesmar new sinekut yitelkal

Such is how people form knowledge about racism and transmit it through each other. Discourse does the work of mediating the knowledge transmission.

11.2. Gender

Discursive psychologists insist that gender is constructed in and through discourse. According to Butler's (1990) theory of performativity, gender is not inscribed onto a biological body. On the contrary, gender is discursively constructed and sustained. Gender is performed by individuals on a daily basis and the everyday performance constructs gender within social and cultural discourse. In other words, she insists that gender identity is constructed within regulative discourses.

According to discursive psychology, gender identity is not permanent, but in the course of being remade and reconstructed. In this process, discourse plays a central role. "discourse enacts, expresses, condones or contributes to the reproduction of inequality." (Van Dijk, 2004:26).

The following community discourses are used as points of departure to explain how discourse is used to disseminate knowledge about gender.

Females as mother are ever lovely

Befkr alem yematselech enat bcha nat only mother is ever lovely (CR 822)

Kenat wuch kesetoch teru neger atetebk

Yenta wuletawan banesa wodalehu
Degnetwa teru mehonun amnalehu
Abatem zelalem yinurlgn lene
Newna maerege marefia leayne
Des blogn bemar salasb lemanm
Benat babate new aydelem bemanm
Huletegna honew kemedehaniale (CR102)

Females are not trustworthy

Bezih alem endeset lekisks yele
Setoch ebakachu yebalochachun emnet atkadu
Wondoch tekotebu gen benante ayferedm
Setna det yene nat aybalm (students' clinic, Wu)
Setna taxi and new huletum terf mechn yiwaldu ()

Females love money men are lovers

Set legenzeb magna nat
Setn tewatna legenzeb teshama
Temetlahalech magnethn stsema (facebook)
Yewond lej wubetukisu new yilalu setoch (students' lounge, WU)
Yewond lej feker eske mekabr yeset lej feker eske meto br (dorm 118)
Set dha yemtwodew film lay bcha new (facebook)

Females are less intelligent than males

Set ena brele hod enji chenklat yelahewm (space 811)
Set lej mnm btamr dalewa enji chinklatwa ayadgm (students' lounge, WU)
Set btawk bewond yalk (dorm 207)

Set wode majet wond wode chilot (211)

Female beautiful are full of problems

Beautiful wife = + addition of enemy
- Subtraction of money
÷ division of idea
× multiplication of problems

Female like physical harassment

Ahyana set dula yiwodlu (dorm 29)
Setna wonfit tefi yiwodalu

Maleness is superiority

Wnodnete kurate (loung)
Wond leg kebrer sil new yemiamrbet ()
Wond lej keznijero meles kale teru new alech ayate (Dorm 206)

Males are unintelligent

The disadvantaged group holds power by access to domination through genres (Street, 2001:13). The public space gives the female disadvantaged groups a chance to fire back.

Endesew yemiasb ahya baynorm endahya yemiasb wond gn moltwal (CR 215)
Yewond lenewtu giziwi sihon jilnetu zelalemawi new

These discourses form the ideas of the community formed about gender. These representations are transmitted from one part of the society to the other through discourse. Discourse mediates knowledge of people about gender.

11.3. Identity

Discourse plays significant role in the construction of knowledge about people's identities. In the public discourses people are educated about different identities revealed by different parts of the society. The following are some examples of identity revealed in discourse.

Woloyes say,
Sakna chewata feker kmarachu edene wololay betewoledachu (CR 214, WU)
Dires say,
Yedre lej negn atknubgn (Students TV Room, AAU)
X- ethnic group say,
I am X- ethnic group first
Not Habesha!
Not Ethiopia! (CR 505, WU)

In such ways people represent their ideas through discourse and get it across. These informal ways of transmission of knowledge helps people reformulate their attitudes, views and beliefs about their and others' identities.

Conclusions

Different discourses from various social practices in the traditional and modern Ethiopian community that are transmitted through oral discourse were studied. The result of the study shows that knowledge through informal education is transmitted through discourse. Knowledge transmission is mediated through discourse. Discourse has become both the means and the end of knowledge and its transmission. Discourse is shaped by many factors such as culture, language, participant, and history. In turn, many things shape discourse. Discourse shapes and reshapes the thought and practice of the community who owns it. It is a replicator, re-constructer and preserver of social change.

Discourse facilitates different changes. It is a major agent of social change through which people manipulate their mind. Social changes are reflections of changes in discourse. Discourses are reinforced by existing systems of education and the media. There is no place to stand outside such systems.

Since it is an institutionalized and systematic way of thinking, discourse takes the role of building, producing, accumulating, reinforcing, constructing, resisting, legitimizing, criticizing and transmitting knowledge. Informal education is all about learning community discourse. In the discourse is embedded the society's cultural performances, beliefs, social practices, norms, rituals, and social rules required for continued existence. Hence, discourse plays the role of mediating knowledge transmission. Everyday discourse carries peoples' ideas and thoughts from on to the other. Knowledge is transmitted through the community discourse which they live by.

References

Biber, D., Conrad, S. and Reppen, R. (1998). *Corpus Linguistics: Investigating language Structure and Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, G. (2003). *Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. New York: Longman Group UK Limited.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis the critical study of language*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. and Wodak, R. (1997). "Critical Discourse Analysis" In: Van Dijk, T.A. (Edr.). *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction* (Vol, 2). *Discourse as Social Interaction* (pp. 258-84). London. Sage Publications.

Fairclough, N. (2005). "Critical discourse analysis in transdisciplinary research." Wodak, Ruth and Chilton, Paul (Eds.). *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis: Theory, methodology and interdisciplinarity* (pp. 53-70). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Gee, J. P. (1999). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. London: Routledge.

Gee, J.P. (2005). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Methods*. (2nd Edition). London: Routledge.

Gumperz, J. (1997). "Communicative Competence". In: *Sociolinguistic: A Reader and Course book* (pp. 39-48). Coupland, N. and Jaworski, A. (Eds.). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Johnstone, B. (2000). *Qualitative Methods in Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Johnstone, B. (2001). "Discourse Analysis and Narrative". *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 635-649). Schiffri, D. et al. (Eds). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Johnstone, B. (2008). *Discourse Analysis* (2nd Ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Jorgensen, M. and Phillips, L. (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: SAGE Publications.

O'Halloran, K. (2011). "Critical discourse analysis." In: Simpson, James. (Edr.). *The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 445- 459). London: Routledge.

Potter, J. (2004). "Discourse analysis as a way of analyzing naturally occurring talk." In D. Silverman (Edr.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method, and practice* (pp. 200-221). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Potter, J. (1996). "Discourse Analysis and Constructionist Approaches: Theoretical Background" In : John T.E. Richardson (Edr.). *Handbook of qualitative research methods for psychology and the social sciences*. Leicester; BPS Books.

Scollon, R. and Scollon, S.W. (2001). "Discourse and Intercultural Communication". In: *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 538-547). Schiffri, Deborah et al. (Eds.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Seidlhofer, B. (2003). *Controversies in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tracy, k. (2001). "Discourse Analysis in Communication". In: *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 725-749). Schiffri, Deborah et al. (Eds.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Van Dijk, Teun A. (1980). *Macrostructures: An Interdisciplinary Study of Global Structures in Discourse, Interaction, and Cognition*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers

Van Dijk, Teun A. (1985). "Structures of News in the Press." In: Van Dijk, Teun. (Edr.). 1985. *Discourse and Communication: New Approaches to the Analysis of Mass media Discourse and Communication* (pp. 69-93). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Van Dijk, Teun A. (2001). "Critical Discourse Analysis". In: *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 352-371). Schiffri, Deborah et al. (Eds.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Van Dijk, Teun A. (2004). "From Text Grammar to Critical Discourse Analysis: A brief academic autobiography." Version 2.0. Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona.

Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse*. London: Sage Publications.

Wodak, R. (2005). "Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis: New Perspectives for Interdisciplinary Gender Studies". Athens.

Wodak, R. and Chilton, P. (Eds.). (2005). *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse methodology and interdisciplinarity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing

Wodak, R. and Meyer. 2009. *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis* (2nd edition)..

*Analysis: Theory,
Company.
London : Sage*